



# THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, DECEMBER 23, 1847.

## NOTICE.

One number more will complete this volume. Subscribers to the Cincinnati Weekly Herald and Philanthropist, who shall not then have paid up all arrears, will be omitted from the list of the *Era*. We must be caught napping at such a crisis—when the proceedings of Congress are assuming an aspect of so much interest.

## IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Subscribers to the *Era* are reminded, that the terms require payment in advance, and that it will not be forwarded any longer than the time for which it has been paid. The time for which many of our subscribers have paid expires December 31st, and unless further payment be made, their papers will then be discontinued.

Only a limited number of copies of the next volume will be printed, and the number required by actual subscribers, and those who intend to renew their subscriptions must do so before the first of January, if they wish an unbroken series of the paper.

Need remind our friends of the importance of sustaining the *Era*, at the capital of the nation, especially at this crisis, when the Congress about to assemble, debates and proceeds upon unprecedented interest will take place upon the two great questions of the War, and the Extension of Slavery? We look upon this as the great test of subscribers, and hope they will use reasonable efforts to extend our list.

## REVIEW OF THE WEEK.

Several deaths have been announced in Congress. Little, however, of importance has been transacted, except the adoption of a resolution to the Rules of the House, calculated to simplify proceedings.

The debate on Mr. Calhoun's resolutions will take place next Tuesday week.

The movement of Mr. Allen in the Senate drew from the South Carolina Senator the avowal that his opinions on the Mexican war were unchanged; and that his resolutions did not touch the question of territorial indemnity. He is, then, still in favor of the defensive line policy.

The debate on Internal Improvements in the House was interesting. Nothing but the ultra schemes of some of the supporters of such improvements can invest this question with a party character. They are the worst enemies, in effect, of the great River, Lake, and Harbor interests.

The resolution of Mr. Wentworth was in the same style as his anti-official resolutions last winter, and was carried through quite summarily and triumphantly. It is a flat contradiction to the veto message of the President; and, when we consider the power of place, the strength of party attachment, and the remarkable ingenuity of that document, this response of the House, carried by more than a two-thirds majority, must be regarded as conclusive.

We shall have something to say next week of the petition relating to the slave trade, the first time, we take pleasure in directing attention to the consistent vote of the Speaker, by which this petition was secured a respectful hearing.

## PROSPECTUS.

The attention of subscribers is requested to the Prospectus of the *Era*, copies of which we send them; and we hope those who are friends of the paper, will circulate them for subscribers.

## ONE WAY OF DOING IT.

The following extract of a letter from a friend in Ohio, to the Publisher, shows one way in which the circulation of our paper may be aided:

"Enclosed I send you a draft for forty dollars, the subscription of eleven new subscribers, and to renew nine old ones. These subscribers have mostly been obtained by the use of the money, and agreeing to take their work in payment."

"Allow me to suggest, that if other friends of the cause would pursue the same course, which hundreds of them have pursued with success, to themselves, your list could easily be doubled."

Yours, truly,

## TABLE OF THE THIRTIETH CONGRESS.

The table of the Thirtieth Congress, which appeared in our last number, was copied from the *Journal of Commerce*, and the credit is due to that source. Messrs Hale and Tuck are classified in it as Whigs. Our readers, of course, corrected this blunder for themselves.

## REPORTS.

We complete this week the publication of the reports of the several Departments. We publish them because, although many will not read them, others, whose wants ought to be consulted, will; because they are important; because we are bound by our prospects to publish important public documents; because we wish the *Era* to be, as far as possible, a faithful record of the times, possessing permanent value. This much for the satisfaction of those who seem to think an Anti-Slavery paper should separate itself from the world as it is.

## THE PRESIDENT AND MR. CALHOUN—THE WAR AND THE FUTURE.

By referring to our Congressional report, it will be seen that among other movements made in regard to our relations with Mexico, one owes its paternity to Mr. Calhoun. He has taken an early opportunity to define his antagonism to the President; for, though his resolutions at first sight appear not to meet any issue directly raised by the Messages, it is only in appearance.

A hasty glance at that document left the impression upon us, that the President disclaimed the policy of the conquest of Mexico; but a closer inspection shows that we were mistaken. The phraseology which deceived us, is rather vague:

"It has never been contemplated by me," he says, "as an object of war, to acquire territory, or to annihilate her separate existence as an independent nation. On the contrary, it has ever been my desire that she should maintain her nationality, and, under a good Government, adapted to her condition, be a free, independent, and prosperous Republic."

Two things are here avowed—that the conquest of Mexico has not been contemplated, as an object of the war; and, that it has always been the desire of the President that she should maintain an independent existence. We shall not question his sincerity in this statement. Let us admit its entire truthfulness. Still, the question arises—Suppose Mexico continue to reject the terms of peace offered by Mr. Polk, and the war be protracted, does not the President contemplate the policy of subjugating her? The supposition that he does, is not precluded, it will be observed, by any avowal or disclaimer that he has made. It is quite possible that he may not have conceived all this when he began the war, and that he was quite willing Mexico should retain a separate existence; and yet, now he may harbor the design, should his overtures be rejected, of carrying on the invasion, till the whole of our sister Republic be conquered, whether he deliberately cherishes this purpose, or not, whether he think the public mind will be gradually accustomed to this idea of wholesale conquest by a succession of partial conquests, or not, is not so material as the fact, that the *line of policy* he has indicated as proper to be pursued in the conduct of the war, inevitably tends to this result. Mark! he demands not only infinitely less injuries done our citizens before the war, but infinitely less for the expenses of the war; and this, it is assumed, can only be paid in money. New Mexico and California are required, as no more than an adequate indemnity now: Mexico demands, denies the claim for the expenses of the war, which she holds to be one of aggression on the part of the United States, and she resolves on continued resistance.

Mr. Polk prosecutes the war for another year, at the expense of thousands of lives more, and some millions more of money. What shall be the indemnity then? Now, it is New Mexico and California; next year, one or two additional States. Will be required, and ought to be, if the principle of demanding indemnity for the war, which he has repeatedly asserted, be just. Acting upon this principle, and judging for ourselves as to what shall be the indemnity, the time will come, when the struggle be still protracted, when the whole of Mexico be still under the yoke of our arms, and the question of indemnity, which he has so often asserted, will be a question of fact, and not of theory. The assertion of this principle by our Government—full indemnity for the expenses of the war—is a virtual sentence of death against her nationality.

"Since the liberal proposition (1) of the United States," says Mr. Polk, "was authorized to be made in April last, large expenditures have been incurred, and the precious blood of many of our patriotic fellow-citizens has been shed in the prosecution of the war. This consideration, and the patriotic perseverance of Mexico in protracting the war, must influence the terms of peace which may be demanded proper heretofore to accept."

This consideration, and the patriotic perseverance of Mexico, and here, we cannot forbear calling attention to our remarkable feature of the foregoing declaration. Mexico, no one doubts, firmly believes that she is the aggrieved party; and, under this conviction, she will submit to no cession of her territory, but perseveres in her attempts to expel the invader. Believing as she does, ought we not to honor her for her national spirit? What shall our attitude be made of who finds in such patriotism, or "obstinate perseverance," as Mr. Polk terms it, good reason for inflicting punishment upon her?

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

of demanding indemnity for the war, which he has repeatedly asserted, be just. Acting upon this principle, and judging for ourselves as to what shall be the indemnity, the time will come, when the struggle be still protracted, when the whole of Mexico be still under the yoke of our arms, and the question of indemnity, which he has so often asserted, will be a question of fact, and not of theory. The assertion of this principle by our Government—full indemnity for the expenses of the war—is a virtual sentence of death against her nationality.

"Since the liberal proposition (1) of the United States," says Mr. Polk, "was authorized to be made in April last, large expenditures have been incurred, and the precious blood of many of our patriotic fellow-citizens has been shed in the prosecution of the war. This consideration, and the patriotic perseverance of Mexico in protracting the war, must influence the terms of peace which may be demanded proper heretofore to accept."

This consideration, and the patriotic perseverance of Mexico, and here, we cannot forbear calling attention to our remarkable feature of the foregoing declaration. Mexico, no one doubts, firmly believes that she is the aggrieved party; and, under this conviction, she will submit to no cession of her territory, but perseveres in her attempts to expel the invader. Believing as she does, ought we not to honor her for her national spirit? What shall our attitude be made of who finds in such patriotism, or "obstinate perseverance," as Mr. Polk terms it, good reason for inflicting punishment upon her?

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

Suppose we were engaged in a struggle with a Power whom we felt to be the aggressor, but who professed to believe itself the aggrieved party; that Power, by the chances of war, had annihilated our armies, and entrenched itself in our strong cities—how we should glorify ourselves for our stubborn patriotism in spurning overtures which we held to be degrading! and how we should deem it an honor to regard the threat to augment its demands just in proportion to our resistance! Has not God made of one blood the Mexican and American? Shall we punish her when we would deem honorable in ourselves? Shall we, Americans, make the love of country a crime, and regard Mexico as criminal just in proportion as she manifests that noble feeling? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do. What have this fell spirit of war makes of the better, more brotherly feelings of our nature? The stubborn resistance Poland opposed to the partitioning schemes of the Northern Powers, and yet this is precisely what Mr. Polk proposes to do.

all meekness; armies may be raised and transported to a foreign country; conquest after conquest may be made; the President, under this power, may govern a country as large as our own, or, by contrast, he may regulate its internal and external commerce, impose a tariff, appoint revenue officers, in fact, put forth all the power of an absolute sovereign, and the people, the Democracy, say amen! and then proceed to question themselves with subtle discussions of the question, whether Congress has the right to improve a harbor, or clear the navigation of a great river.

The People, the Democracy especially, abhor public debt. The nation has been growing popular for years, and that such exuberance ought to bear its own burdens—that we have no right to impose wasting burdens upon our posterity. Standing armies, too, used to excite our profoundest fears. One Presidential candidate, a few years ago, was defeated for this, among other reasons, that he was reported to favor a kind of voluntary military establishment. But we have outgrown these boyish notions. Where are we? On the 1st of December, according to the official statement, the public debt was forty-five millions of dollars, of which the sum of twenty millions has been contracted in the prosecution of a war of eighteen months' duration. But the Treasury is exhausted, and to meet the expenses of this fiscal year, we learn from the President, that another loan of eighteen millions and a half is immediately necessary; and the war continuing, another loan of twenty millions and a half will be necessary for the fiscal year ending 30th, 1849, and, in addition, the people of the North and West, upon whom this great burden would fall, can be persuaded to submit to a tax on tea and coffee. That would reduce the loan a little. But they will not submit to any such tax; so that, before the lapse of eighteen months more, the public debt will have reached the sum of eighty-five millions!

Having laid this broad foundation for a public blessing, as some regard it, the next thing is to provide an ample military establishment. The fifty thousand volunteers authorized by law, have all been called for. The ten additional regiments called out last winter, have been raised. But this is not enough. A new supply of materials for destruction is needed. Ten regiments more of regular forces are demanded, and authority is also asked to raise not less than twenty-five thousand more volunteers. Who doubts that, as the winter passes, authority will be asked to re-enlist as many of these volunteers as can be prevailed upon to accept of a new term of service? The army shall have expired? Some comfort would it be, were there an end to these things. But who can foresee the end?

This formidable force is to be cut loose from domestic attachments, wedded to the camp, transported to a foreign country, placed under the control of ambitious leaders, who are already so deeply in love with military life and distinction that the death of the nation would be no sacrifice to them. They will demand the conquest of all Mexico. The doctrine of Free Trade has been making converts everywhere in Europe and in this country. The Democracy especially have thrown up their hats, shouting glory to the tariff of 1846. Is that for free trade? Is it not the favorite doctrine of the Free Traders, that a tariff is a tax upon the people, who pay so much additional per cent. on every article they use, which bears a duty? Now, what is the boast of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury? That the Tariff of 1846 yields more than the Tariff of 1842. If the people then under the latter paid \$23,000,000 of taxes, they pay \$23,000,000 under that of 1846. We do not say that the principle adopted is not a more equitable one, that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that yields annually twenty-eight millions of dollars. There is no free trade about such a Tariff. It has reduced and equalized duties, and in this way caused an increased and more extensive consumption of foreign imports—in other words, multiplied consumers, and increased consumption. But if there be any truth in the principles of Free Trade, these consumers are taxed, heavily taxed. Can the Tariff be altered for the better, while this war shall continue? Not unless the alteration should increase the revenue; that is, suggest the absolute amount of taxation. And yet, we had some of the warmest advocates of Free Trade shouting that the tariff is a tax upon the people, and that the duties are not more justly imposed—but we do say that the people of this country are heavily taxed by a Tariff that



the city  
we with  
by the  
finish;  
the best  
Over-  
ring de-  
rma.  
OK.